SOURCE SELECTION MEMORANDUM

Origins-Spectral Interpretation-Resource Identification-Security-Regolith Explorer (OSIRIS-Rex) Visible and Infrared Spectrometer (OVIRS) Linear Variable Filter (LVF)

This Source Selection Statement documents the selection decision for the OSIRIS-REx OVIRS LVF procurement.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

This procurement is for the design, fabrication, testing, and delivery of linear variable filters for use in the OSIRIS-REx mission OVIRS instrument. The Engineering Test Unit (ETU) linear variable filter array will be delivered four (4) months after contract award. The Flight Unit linear variable filter and flight spare linear variable filter array will be delivered eight (8) months after contract award.

On November 7, 2012, the OVIRS LVF Evaluation Team met with the Source Selection Authority to determine which of the proposals submitted in response to RFP NNG12434219R-1. The following companies submitted proposals:

- JDS Uniphase (JDSU)
- Sonoma Photonics, Inc.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Each proposal was evaluated in accordance with FAR 15.305, NFS 1815.305, and the evaluation factors contained in the RFP as listed below.

The RFP included three evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance.

The relative order of importance of the evaluation factors was stated in the solicitation as follows:

"The Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, the Price Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Past Performance Factor."

The Mission Suitability Factor was comprised of the following weighted subfactors.

		Points
Subfactor A:	Technical Approach	700
Subfactor B:	Management Approach	300
	Total Points	1,000

Each Mission Suitability Subfactor and the overall mission suitability factor were evaluated using the adjectival rating definitions and percentile ranges at NFS 15.305(a)(3)(A). In addition, the Evaluation Team evaluated, but did not point score, the Past Performance and Price Factors. The Mission Suitability findings and scores, and the proposed price and past performance information were provided to the Source Selection Authority.

FINDINGS AND EVALUATION

The following chart provides the results for each offeror by subfactor:

Factor	Offeror	
Mission Suitability	**JDSU**	**SPI**
Subfactor A: Technical Approach	Good	Fair
Subfactor B: Management Approach	Good	Good
Total Mission Suitability Score	635	530
Past Performance (Level of Confidence)	High	High
Price	JDSU has the lowest proposed price, and SPI's proposed price was significantly higher than JDSU's proposed price.	

MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR EVALUATION

JDS Uniphase (JDSU) Mission Suitability Factor

The JDSU proposal received a total Mission Suitability score of 635 for all Mission Suitability subfactors as indicated below.

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

For the Technical Approach subfactor, JDSU's proposal received a final rating of "Good" with no significant strengths, no strengths, one (1) weakness, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

JDSU's weakness was that the compliance matrix shows two exceptions involving the out-of-band (OOB) blocking. The exceptions are relatively benign and apply at the shorter wavelengths where the effect is less, and the instrument will be slightly comprised.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

For the Management Approach subfactor, JDSU's proposal received a rating of "Good" There were no significant strengths, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, no weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

Sonoma Photonics, Inc. (SPI)

The SPI proposal received a total Mission Suitability score of 530 for all Mission Suitability subfactors.

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

For the Technical Approach Subfactor, Sonoma's proposal received a final rating of "Fair" with no significant strengths, no strengths, one (1) significant weakness, no weaknesses, and deficiencies.

SPI's significant weakness was that the compliance matrix shows two exceptions involving the OOB. The proposed exception to the average allowed transmittance is unacceptable as it will adversely impact the ability to meet instrument performance requirements. This creates the risk that the OOB technical performance of the instrument will be significantly compromised.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

For the Management Approach subfactor, SPI's proposal received a rating of "Good". There were no significant strengths, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, no weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

PAST PERFORMANCE

This factor included an evaluation of the relevance of prior work, as well as the technical, schedule and cost performance on prior contracts. This factor is not point scored. The evaluation of past performance included, but was not limited to, the responses received to the questionnaires provided to each Offeror's references and the review of these responses by the Evaluation Team.

JDSU

JDSU had two (2) contracts that were considered significantly relevant to the OVIRS effort. The performance ratings given in the survey responses for both efforts were positive. The overall technical performance was rated "Very High" to "High". Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the OVIRS effort.

SPI

SPI had one (1) contract that was considered significantly relevant. The performance ratings in the survey response were overall positive. The overall technical performance was rated "High". Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the OVIRS effort.

PRICE FACTOR EVALUATION

JDSU has the lowest proposed price, and SPI's proposed price was significantly higher than JDSU's proposed price.

DECISION

I carefully reviewed and agree with the findings made by the Evaluation Team.

My selection was based on a comparative assessment of each proposal against each of the source selection factors. JDSU's proposal offers an advantage over the SPI proposal in the area of Mission Suitability, which is the most important evaluation factor. Also, JDSU offers a significant advantage in terms of price which is the second most important evaluation factor. Past performance, the third and final factor, did not result in a discriminator between JDSU and SPI, both companies received a "High" level of confidence.

Based on the above, I found that JDSU represented the best value to the Government by offering the highest technical proposal and lowest price. Accordingly, I select JDSU for the award of the Origins-Spectral Interpretation-Resource Identification-Security-Regolith Explorer (OSIRIS-Rex) Visible and Infrared Spectrometer (OVIRS) Linear Variable Filter (LVF) contract.

Teresa Anthony
Source Selection Authority

12/13/12
Date